

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 2, 2008. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 11. Reconsideration and favorable action in this case are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claim 1-24 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims 1-21 of copending Ser. No. 10/618,859. Once claims are allowed, Applicants will address whether a terminal disclaimer should be filed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 11, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinek in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5652793 to Priem. Applicants have reviewed these references in detail and do not believe that they disclose or make obvious the invention as claimed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-10 and 12-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinek in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5652793 to Priem and further in view of FRC 2459 to Housley. Applicants have reviewed these references in detail and do not believe that they disclose or make obvious the invention as claimed.

In the Examiner's remarks, he states the "if the claims were amended to specifically identify how the step of 'verifying a binding between contents of the system program and the computing device' was claimed, it would then overcome the prior art teachings." Applicant has clarified how the binding is verified in independent claims 1 and 11.

In the amended claims, a signature derived from the system software in memory is compared to a signature derived from an authorized version of the system software for the processing circuitry, where the association between signature derived from the authorized version and a unique identifier for the processing circuitry can be verified. Thus, any

unauthorized modification of the system software will cause a mismatch between the signatures of the actual system software and the authorized system software, and any modification of the signature of the authorized system software will break the association with the unique identifier for the processing system.

This aspect of the invention is not shown by any of the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of independent claims 1 and 11 and of dependent claims 2-10 and 12-24.

An extension of one month is requested and a Request for Extension of Time under § 1.136 with the appropriate fee is attached hereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment, including extension fees, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Alan W. Lintel, Applicants' Attorney at (972) 664-9595 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Alan W. Lintel/

Alan W. Lintel
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32478

November 3, 2008
Anderson, Levine & Lintel
14785 Preston Rd.
Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75254
Tel. (972) 664-9595